UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/043,478 | 01/10/2002 | Christopher J. Frantz | COMP:0278 P01-4017 | 6440 |

7590 06/23/2004

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
LEGAL DEPARTMENT, M/S 35
PO BOX 272400
FT. COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| VITAL, PIERRE M | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 2188 | 9 |

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/043,478 | Applicant(s) FRANTZ ET AL. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Examiner Pierre M. Vital | Art Unit 2188 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 June 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 4, 2004 has been entered.

### *Response to Amendment*

2. This Office Action is in response to applicant's communication filed June 4, 2004 in response to PTO Office Action mailed March 8, 2004. The Applicant's remarks and amendments to the claims and/or the specification were considered with the results that follow.

3. Claims 1-24 have been presented for examination in this application. In response to the last Office Action, claims 1, 10-13, 15-19 and 21-23 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. As a result, claims 1-23 are now pending in this application.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments, see Paper No. 8, filed June 4, 2004, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s) 1-24 under 35 USC 102(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Braithwaite at al (6,104,561).

5. As to the remarks, applicant asserted that:

(a) Wambach fails to disclose identifying the write protect status of the computer diskette based on the failure code.

Examiner respectfully traverses applicant's arguments for the following reasons. Examiner would like to point out that Wambach discloses sending an error signal to the computer when a request to write to a protected location is sent to the mass memory (see column 2, lines 40-45). Considering that the mass memory can be a removable media disk drive and that Wambach does not specifically teach that the disk drive is a diskette (i.e., floppy disk), a new ground of rejection in view of the Braithwaite et al reference has been made to overcome this deficiency.

(b) MacLeod fails to disclose identifying the write protect status of the computer diskette based on the failure code.

Examiner respectfully traverses applicant's arguments for the following reasons. Examiner would like to point out that MacLeod discloses returning an error code to the host if a sector is write protected (see column 7, lines 7-13). Considering that a DVD is a removable media disk drive and that MacLeod does not specifically teach that the disk drive is a diskette (i.e., floppy disk), a new ground of rejection in view of the Braithwaite et al reference has been made to overcome this deficiency.

(c) Wambach and MacLeod teach away from one another.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both MacLeod and Wambach are in the field of applicant's endeavor and are reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned (i.e., data security or data protection of a storage location). Thus, they can be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Braithwaite at al (US6,104,561).

As per claim 1, Braithwaite discloses a method of automatically identifying a write protect status of a computer diskette, comprising the acts of interacting with the computer diskette to produce a failure code indicative of the write protect status [*the invention is primarily intended for use in a conventional floppy disk drive or other floppy disk drive that receives removable cartridges*; col. 2, lines 35-40; *a first location stores a code indicative of a protection mode of the storage medium*; col. 2, lines 44-46]; and identifying the write protect status of the computer diskette based on the failure code [*the disk drive reports an error whenever access to the storage medium is inhibited by the protection mode*; col. 2, lines 58-61].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wambach et al (US6,330,648) and Braithwaite at al (US6,104,561).

As per claim 1, Wambach discloses a method of automatically identifying a write protect status of a computer removable media disk drive, comprising the acts of interacting with the computer removable media disk drive to produce a failure code indicative of the write protect status [*value of protected sector bit is sensed before permitting writing to that sector*; col. 2, lines 4-6; *specified address is compared with list of protected memory locations for each write request*; col. 4, lines 23-27]; and identifying the write protect status of the computer removable media disk drive based on the failure code [*a flag value of "1" by the write protection code implemented as programmed microprocessor with its program stored to prevent writing to that sector*; col. 2, lines 6-12, 40-45; *if a match is found, write operation is aborted*; col. 4, lines 27-36; also see abstract].

However, Wambach does not specifically teach that the removable media disk drive is a diskette (i.e., floppy disk) as recited in the claim.

Braithwaite discloses a write protecting scheme using a floppy disk that can provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of

the host computer (col. 2, lines 35-41; col. 4, lines 25-28). Since the technology for implementing a floppy disk in a write protecting scheme was well known and since the floppy disk can provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer, an artisan would have been motivated to implement a floppy disk in the system of Wambach. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to use a floppy disk in the system of Wambach because it was well known to provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer as taught by Braithwaite.

As per claim 3, Wambach discloses the act of interacting with the computer diskette comprises the act of interacting with a non-storage area of the computer diskette [*write protection circuit code implemented as programmed microprocessor with its program stored to respond to a request to write to a protected mass memory location*; col. 2, lines 41-43; abstract].

As per claim 4, Wambach discloses the act of interacting with the non-storage area comprises the act of attempting to write data to the non-storage area [*request to write to a protected mass memory location*; col. 2, lines 41-43].

As per claim 6, Wambach discloses the act of interacting with the computer diskette to produce the failure code comprises the act of generating a write protect

failure code if the write protect status of the computer diskette is write protected [*an illegal command is sent to the mass memory and an error signal (or illegal command) is issued back to the computer in response to a write to a protected mass memory location*; col. 2, lines 41-45].

As per claim 7, Wambach discloses the acts of interacting with the computer diskette and identifying the write protect status are performed upon receipt of an access request to the computer diskette [*a request to write to a protected mass memory location causes an illegal command to be sent to the mass memory and an error signal issued back to the computer*; col. 2, lines 41-45].

As per claim 8, Wambach discloses the act of receiving the access request from a remote computer [*interface card 110 installed between computer and mass memory is at a remote location*; Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 36-40].

As per claim 10, Wambach discloses a method of identifying a write protect status of a removable media, comprising the acts of seeking to a location beyond the storage area of the removable media [*software or irreplaceable data are stored in a list of protected memory locations with which each write request is compared*; col. 1, lines 41-48; col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 22]; attempting to write data to the removable media at the non-storage location [*write to the list of protected locations provides a match*; col. 4, lines 23-30]; evaluating a failure code produced by the attempted write [*a flag value of "1" by the write protection code implemented as programmed microprocessor with its program stored to prevent writing to that sector*; col. 2, lines 6-12]; and identifying the write protect status of the removable media based on the failure code [*if a match is found, write operation is aborted*; col. 4, lines 27-36].

However, Wambach does not specifically teach that the removable media disk drive is a diskette (i.e., floppy disk) as recited in the claim.

Braithwaite discloses a write protecting scheme using a floppy disk that can provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer (col. 2, lines 35-41; col. 4, lines 25-28). Since the technology for implementing a floppy disk in a write protecting scheme was well known and since the floppy disk can provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer, an artisan would have been motivated to implement a floppy disk in the system of Wambach. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to use a floppy disk in the system of Wambach because it was well known to provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer as taught by Braithwaite.

As per claim 14, Wambach discloses the acts of seeking, attempting to write data evaluating the failure code, and identifying the write protect status are initiated by a remote computer [*interface card 110 installed between computer and mass memory is at a remote location*; Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 36-40].

As per claim 15, comprising processing an access request from the remote computer for access to the removable media [*write protection circuit responds to a request to write to a protected mass memory location*; col. 2, lines 41-43].

As per claim 16, Wambach discloses the act of attempting to write data causes the failure code to be a write protect error if the write protect status of the removable media is write protected [*an error signal is issued back to the computer in response to a write to a protected mass memory location*; col. 2, lines 41-45].

As per claim 17, Wambach discloses the act of attempting to write data causes the failure code to be an invalid write error if the write protect status of the removable media is not write protected [*an illegal command is sent to the mass memory in response to a write to a protected mass memory location*; col. 2, lines 41-45].

10. Claims 1, 10, 18, 19 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacLeod (US6,598,135) and Braithwaite at al (US6,104,561).

As per claim 1, MacLeod discloses a method of automatically identifying a write protect status of a rewriteable data storage media, comprising the acts of interacting with the rewriteable data storage media to produce a failure code indicative of the write protect status [*data to a sector can be read many times*; col. 2, lines 26-28; *overwrite of a previously written sector is prevented*; col. 6, lines 14-23]; the rewriteable data storage media being removable and rewriteable [*DVD-RAM can be removed*; col. 3, lines 18-20; *rewriting of a*

*previously written sector is allowed*; col. 4, lines 58-61]; and identifying the write protect status of the rewriteable data storage media based on the failure code [*the sector is write protected if Write Protect Flag and Sector Written Flag match, an error code is returned to the Host*; col. 7, lines 7-13].

However, MacLeod does not specifically teach that the removable media disk drive is a diskette (i.e., floppy disk) as recited in the claim.

Braithwaite discloses a write protecting scheme using a floppy disk that can provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer (col. 2, lines 35-41; col. 4, lines 25-28). Since the technology for implementing a floppy disk in a write protecting scheme was well known and since the floppy disk can provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer, an artisan would have been motivated to implement a floppy disk in the system of MacLeod. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to use a floppy disk in the system of MacLeod because it was well known to provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer as taught by Braithwaite.

As per claim 10, MacLeod discloses a method of identifying a write protect status of a removable media, comprising the acts of seeking to a non-storage location beyond a storage area of the removable media [*sector is written and cannot be overwritten*; col. 6, lines 14-23]; attempting to write data to the removable media at the non-storage location [*preventing overwriting of a previously written sector*; col. 6, lines 14-23]; evaluating a failure code produced by the attempted write [*the sector is write protected if Write Protect Flag and Sector Written Flag match, an error code is returned to the Host*; col. 7, lines 7-13]; and identifying the write protect status of the removable media based on the failure code [*the sector is write protected if Write Protect Flag and Sector Written Flag match*; col. 7, lines 7-13].

However, MacLeod does not specifically teach that the removable media disk drive is a diskette (i.e., floppy disk) as recited in the claim.

Braithwaite discloses a write protecting scheme using a floppy disk that can provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer (col. 2, lines 35-41; col. 4, lines 25-28). Since the technology for implementing a floppy disk in a write protecting scheme was well known and since the floppy disk can provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer, an artisan would have been motivated to implement a floppy disk in the system of MacLeod. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to use a floppy disk in the system of MacLeod because it was well known to provide flexibility because the disk can interface

with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer as taught by Braithwaite.

As per claim 18, MacLeod discloses a method of identifying a write protect status of a rewriteable data storage media, comprising the acts of reading data from the rewriteable data storage media at a storage location [*data to a sector can be read many times*; col. 2, lines 26-28]; attempting to write the data back to the rewriteable data storage media [*overwrite of a previously written sector is prevented*; col. 6, lines 14-23]; and identifying the write protect status of the rewriteable data storage media as write protected if a write protect error code is observed [*the sector is write protected if Write Protect Flag and Sector Written Flag match, an error code is returned to the Host*; col. 7, lines 7-13].

However, MacLeod does not specifically teach that the removable media disk drive is a diskette (i.e., floppy disk) as recited in the claim.

Braithwaite discloses a write protecting scheme using a floppy disk that can provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer (col. 2, lines 35-41; col. 4, lines 25-28). Since the technology for implementing a floppy disk in a write protecting scheme was well known and since the floppy disk can provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer, an artisan would have been motivated to implement a

floppy disk in the system of MacLeod. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to use a floppy disk in the system of MacLeod because it was well known to provide flexibility because the disk can interface with a host computer and can be employed as a stand-alone unit, or alternatively, can be installed in an internal bay of the host computer as taught by Braithwaite.

As per claim 19, MacLeod discloses the acts of reading data, attempting to write the data, and identifying the write protect status are initiated automatically upon insertion of the removable media into a media drive [*a method of write protection is illustrated which starts upon insertion of the optical disk in the drive, where the drive reads the physical format information*, Figs. 3A, 3B; col. 6, lines 44-65].

As per claim 22, MacLeod discloses the act of attempting to write the data causes the write protect failure code if the removable media is write protected [*if the sector is write-protected, an error code is returned*; col. 7, lines 9-13].

As per claim 23, MacLeod discloses the act of attempting to write the data succeeds if the removable media is not write-protected [*if the Write Protect Flag is not set, the sector is empty, write operations to the sector shall be allowed*; col. 7, lines 14-16].

As per claim 24, MacLeod discloses the act of attempting to write the data comprises the act of attempting to rewrite the data over the data existing at the storage location [*overwriting of a previously written sector*; col. 6, lines 14].

11. Claims 2, 5, 9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wambach et al (US6,330,648) and Braithwaite at al (US6,104,561) and MacLeod (US6,598,135).

As per claims 2, 11 and 12, the combination of Wambach and Braithwaite discloses the claimed invention as detailed above in the previous paragraphs. However, Wambach and Braithwaite do not specifically teach the act of identifying a media type and storage area of the computer diskette as recited in the claim.

MacLeod discloses the act of identifying a media type and storage area of a computer diskette [*the drive reads the media type and the sector written flag (SWF)*; col. 6, lines 44-65].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wambach and Braithwaite and MacLeod before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Wambach and Braithwaite to include the act of identifying a media type and storage area of a computer diskette because it was well known to provide a reliable method of protecting data by generating an error message and no further processing will be allowed until a valid media type is placed in the drive [col. 2, lines 9-10; col. 6, lines 51-54] as taught by MacLeod.

As per claim 5, the combination of Wambach and Braithwaite discloses the claimed invention as detailed above in the previous paragraphs. However, Wambach and Braithwaite do not specifically teach the act of interacting with the computer diskette comprises the acts of reading data from a storage location of the computer diskette; and attempting to write the data back to the computer diskette as recited in the claim.

MacLeod discloses the act of interacting with a computer diskette comprises the acts of reading data from a storage location of the computer diskette [*data to a sector can be read many times*; col. 2, lines 26-28]; and attempting to write the data back to the computer diskette [*the sector is write protected if Write Protect Flag and Sector Written Flag match, an error code is returned to the Host*; col. 7, lines 7-13].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wambach and Braithwaite and MacLeod before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Wambach and Braithwaite to include the act of interacting with a computer diskette comprises the acts of reading data from a storage location of the computer diskette; and attempting to write the data back to the computer diskette because it was well known to provide a lower level of write protection by allowing the storage and retrieval of data to/from the diskette in a manner consistent with the standard for DVD-RAM [col. 3, lines 5-6, 38-40] as taught by MacLeod.

As per claims 9 and 13, the combination of Wambach and Braithwaite discloses the claimed invention as detailed above in the previous paragraphs. However, Wambach and Braithwaite do not specifically teach the acts of interacting with the computer diskette and identifying the write protect status are performed automatically upon insertion of the computer diskette into a disk drive as recited in the claim.

MacLeod discloses the acts of interacting with a computer diskette and identifying a write protect status are performed automatically upon insertion of the computer diskette into a disk drive [*a method of write protection is illustrated which starts upon insertion of the optical disk in the drive, where the drive reads the physical format information*, Figs. 3A, 3B; col. 6, lines 44-65].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wambach and Braithwaite and MacLeod before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Wambach and Braithwaite to include the acts of interacting with a computer diskette and identifying a write protect status are performed automatically upon insertion of the computer diskette into a disk drive because it was well known to provide a reliable method of protecting data by generating an error message and no further processing will be allowed until a valid media type is placed in the drive [col. 2, lines 9-10; col. 6, lines 51-54] as taught by MacLeod.

12. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacLeod (US6,598,135) and Braithwaite at al (US6,104,561) and Wambach et al (US6,330,648).

As per claim 20 and 21, the combination of MacLeod and Braithwaite discloses the claimed invention as detailed above in the previous paragraphs. However, MacLeod and Braithwaite do not specifically teach the acts of reading data, attempting to write the data, and identifying the write protect status are initiated by a remote computer; and processing an access request from the remote computer for access to the removable media as recited in the claims.

Wambach discloses the acts of reading data, attempting to write the data, and identifying the write protect status are initiated by a remote computer [*interface card 110 installed between computer and mass memory is at a remote location*; Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 36-40]; and processing an access request from the remote computer for access to the removable media [*write protection circuit responds to a request to write to a protected mass memory location*; col. 2, lines 41-43].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of MacLeod and Braithwaite and Wambach before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of MacLeod and Braithwaite to include the acts of reading data, attempting to write the data, and identifying the write protect status are initiated by a remote computer; and processing an access request from the remote computer for access to a removable media because it was well known to provide a

computer which is impervious to unauthorized or accidental overwriting of key sectors by providing a computer not susceptible to tampering by a computer virus stored in the mass memory [col. 1, lines 32-38] as taught by Wambach.

***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 (c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach write protecting a diskette or floppy disk in a removable media disk drive.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre M. Vital whose telephone number is (703) 306-5839. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30 am - 6:00 pm, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan can be reached on (703) 306-2903. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 17, 2004

Pierre M. Vital
Examiner
Art Unit 2188